## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The claims outstanding in this application are Claims 1, 3-12, and 14-19. The Examiner has rejected Claim 1 stating that Guide teaches to charge for an advertising cost for an advertising

5    size wherein said advertising cost incrementally decreases for each incremental increase in said advertising size [referring to Page 6 of Guide] and that Evans ['654] teaches the use of a computer to promote business via the Internet.

The Examiner is correct in stating that advertising size

10    relates not only to physically observable size [quarter-page ad, half-page ad, full-page ad, and the like] but also includes byte size [though observable size is important in that a large byte-size JPEG which may encompass a small portion on one's computer screen could consume many megabytes]. Regardless, with that

15    Applicant has no dispute.

Applicant further agrees that purchasing a full-page ad in one issue would cost x-dollars while purchasing the same full-page ad for 6 months would generally cost less than 6x-dollars [e.g., total cost of 4x-dollars rather than 6x-dollars] thereby reducing

20    the cost of each single full-page ad by approximately 33.3%. In this example, assume the full-page ad for one issue would yield a total cost $120.00 [X] and a cost of $120/per ad. Purchasing the full-page ad for 6 months would yield a total cost of $480.00 [4X], rather than a total cost of $720.00 [6X], and a cost of

$80/per ad; a 33.3% reduction per ad but a 200% increase for the merchant/advertiser in the _total cost_. And this is the key to Applicant's inventive concept.

Applicant's Claim 1 defines the unheard-of, the
5    unanticipated, and the opposite and an attempt to convey such was made and defined in the claim but may not have been done so as artfully as could have been. The larger the advertisement space/size ordered by a merchant/advertiser in Applicant's system/method, the lower the total cost. For example [and
10    forgetting about JPEGs and the like], an ad encompassing one-fourth of a computer screen may yield a total cost to the merchant/advertiser of x-dollars, while an ad which encompasses one-half of the computer screen would yield a _total cost_, not per ad cost as in the prior art, to the merchant/advertiser of 75% of
15    x-dollars, while yet another ad which encompasses the full computer screen would yield a total cost to the merchant/advertiser of 50% of x-dollars or less. Applicant believes it is the choice of words and limitations set forth in the claims which does not as clearly convey this concept and
20    requests of the Examiner a suggestion which would convey such to the Examiner.

As mentioned before, albeit not as artfully as necessary, the feature of lowering the total cost of the ad, even lower than described above, in instances where the merchant/advertiser is

willing to give the consumer a discount coupon for the purchase of the merchant/advertiser's product or services [see Claim 12]. Such is not present in Guide or Evans ['654] or in any prior art teachings of which Applicant is aware. Consequently, in addition to a lower initial <u>total cost</u>, the merchant/advertiser will realize an even greater lower final <u>total cost</u> if the merchant/advertiser gives the consumer a discount on the merchant/advertiser's products/services. Such total cost will be lower with each increase in discounts the merchant/advertiser gives. Reference is made to Applicant's response filed on September 10, 2008, pages 11-12 and such is hereby incorporated by reference herein.

Applicant contends that these features [greater observable size yields less in <u>total cost</u> for an advertisement regardless of duration AND if a discount is offered by the merchant/advertiser to the consumer, the <u>total cost</u> will be lowered even more. Moreover, <u>the greater the discount</u> being offered by the merchant/advertiser will lower the total cost for the advertisement.

In view of the clear distinctions between the cited prior art and the present claims, applicant respectfully requests early reconsideration, allowance, and issue of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

7750 Dagget St., Ste 203          /Frank G. Morkunas/
San Diego, CA 92111
Phone: 858-565-0799              Frank G. Morkunas
Fax:   858-268-9968             Reg. No. 38,974, C/N 23,653